6/30/71

Dear Ed,

Mail was heavy and late this a.m., so I've less than the usual insufficient time for response. Of the enclosures with your 6/25, delayed by one stamp too few, I've taken time to read but one now. I'll do the others, all looking very interesting, in odds and ends of free minutes. As I just looked at them fascinating phrases caught my eye, such as that Fisher was "chairman" of the panel (MMN), when there was none, but he did act in this capacity as he has confirmed to me in writing. The Bruno reminds me of something I've mislaid if you have it: the exact source of JFK's comment that he had to take the CIA apart and scatter it to the four winds. I would like to cite it in current writing. Glad to get the Chile clip from the Guardian, one of the papers I had to stop getting because the slight costs in each case amounted in context to considerable costs and because I just do not have time to go over these things. I must concentrate on the writing and legal work I'm into. Jerry will be here this weekend and can fill you in after his return. He'll probably read parts of two books on which I'm working simultaneously.

Your comment on the medical writing is well taken. I'd add this indication they knew better, assuming, as you say, that the facts were facts, "as presented to us". In short, their escape hatch.

The Garison situation is beyond my comprehension or explanation. I know Alford (who also offered to drop a prosecution in which he thought I had a personal interest!) but have no way of knowing whether or not he has political ambition. He is about Garrison's hulk, seemed like a decent plodder, is one of those to whom I accurately predicted the outcome of the case as they outlined their presentation to me the Sunday before the jury impanelling began. He and Oser and Alcock and Too had all gotten on a conference-call line to persuade me to go there after I had told Bertel the previous Friday I would have nothing more to do with them. I did believe them, and Oser and Alford did meet me at the airport Sunday. I worked with them what for them is a long day, maybe 6-7 hours, outlined some things I had already given them to be sure they understood it, like the medical stuff, and when they had pressing social obligations I began writing PMIII. But personally he always seemed like a nice, honest guy. For all the legit complaints, I have difficulty seeing Garrison taking graft. I think he is sick, not crooked. The quite rare instances where as a layman I'd have questions are normal for lawyers and do not involve money. Part of adversary practise.

Many thanks,

Best,